for public service that's been lost in the fog of consolidation. Try telling someone that the American people are the real landlords of the broadcast airwaves and that broadcasters are enjoying rent control perks and see what kind of looks you'll get. We all know the truth of what's really going on here. When President Bush assured the Iraqi people that Iraq's oilfields were properly owned by the Iraqi people, I couldn't help but think about that other rhetoric we hear so often that the American public owns the airwaves. We're frankly sick of empty promises.

Everyone in this room needs to carry around the following statement as our organizing principle. The airwaves do not belong to the broadcasters. They do not belong to the advertisers. The owners, by law, are the people of the United States. Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change this dynamic. We will. The public airwaves are an entitlement not a privilege. An inalienable mandate in a free and open society, not something to wax philosophical over or read about in our history books.

If we truly want a free media, and if we truly want the best advertisement of what America's story is to the world, whether it's in Iraq, Afghanistan or anywhere else, then we need to keep this mandate by our sides and show the world what a truly free and liberated people's media looks like. Thank you.

MR. STARR: Hi, my name is Steven Starr. I'm one of the founders of the Los Angeles Independent Media Center. And I recently had the privilege of managing KPFK, the Pacifica station locally. The decisions the commissioners are studying today -- we discussed today -- they'll have a profound affect, as the woman said before me on the way America sees us.

We speak with fervor these days about freedoms -- freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of expression. But every time Commissioner Powell declares the market as his religion, which he's done frequently, one wonders if he recognizes what the rest of the world thinks about his respect for any of the other freedoms we speak off.

When former FCC Chairman Mark Fowler declared that "the perception of broadcasters as community trustees should be replaced by a view of broadcasting as marketplace participants," the FCC apparently decided that the economics of scale trumped democracy, and the efficiencies of capital trumped freedom of speech.

Our First Amendment demands journalists serve the public interest, not the political or the business interests of media owners. The FCC has failed to tell us how relaxing these laws will allow mainstream journalists more freedom to serve the public directly. And one wonders how many television journalists are sleeping well these days. A few, I think, the good ones I know are deeply troubled by the parameters of the

journalism they are permitted to practice.

Case in point: The looting of Iraqi museums struck many as the greatest cultural disaster in modern history, but we can't find the story on television, except to see our Secretary of Defense shrug and say, "Stuff happens." Five thousand years of our cultural history dismissed with a shrug. One wonders what seeds are planted when that's the entire conversation we offer to those watching satellite-casts, all over the world.

I remember a time when a man we all admire said we should all be judged by the content of our character and not the color of our skin. Today we are here as citizens, as parents, as members of a civil society to understand that America as a nation will be judged in this age of media by the character of our content.

You see, the character of our content as it proliferates all over the world tells a story about America, a story that people will either respect or reject. If that story isn't told with diversity, if that story isn't told from a sense of place, a place that allows for a broad spectrum of thought, that enables ideas to be argued with passion and mutual respect, then our American story isn't worth telling to the rest of the world.

Again, it is up to this commission to understand that the character of our content will be defined entirely by the liberties implicit in our ideas. That our children's future

will be insured by the protections under which those ideas are expressed. And that our security in the eyes of the world will only be guaranteed by a global perception that we are here to advance the prospect for democracy before capital, for human diversity before market controls, and for freedom of expression before shareholder demands.

I urge you to consider this carefully. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: I'm Michael Turner Thomas. I'm a micro-power broadcaster, unlicensed. And I can say openly that the corporate media in this country has been outright hostile to Africans in America. I experience it every day. I walk down the street, people will approach me on a sidewalk, and they will walk out into the street to avoid getting close to me. Because, according to the corporate media, I am a criminal because I'm of obvious African ancestry and I have a penis.

Well, I am none of that, other than being of obvious African ancestry and having a penis.

I am not judged by my intellect, my intelligence, nor the goodness in my heart. I'm making a point of this in particular because of the limited way to combat the image of distortion that is being projected by the lying, corporate media.

One particular case in point is the funeral of Huey

Newton. Channel 2, up in Oakland, broadcast something critical

of Huey Newton just before his funeral. And representatives of

that particular station showed up at his funeral, much to the

dismay of a lot of people to whom Huey Newton is a hero. And I happen to be one of them. The people reacted by beating up the members of the corporate media for that image of distortion.

The very next day, that very same television station that presented that twisted view turned around and modified their views on Huey Newton and projected a more positive image of him. And, indeed, the man did well to try to promote the cause for Africans in America.

Now, to say to engage in combat in something like this, it is terrible. It shouldn't have to come that way, but looking at the coup de tat -- I mean the election campaign of 2000, the Philadelphia police beat up protesters for nothing. The Los Angeles Police beat up protesters in this town for nothing at both of the conventions for the major political parties. And, of course, the media said that the police did such a great job in the handling of this. They did neither. And I think that we should have some recourse greater than actual combat to bring some honesty and integrity to the lying, corporate media. Thank you.

MS. GRUMAY: My name is Michelle Grumay and I'm a member of the Screen Actors Guild. But I'm here as an individual.

And I wanted to address the -- Commissioner Copps about this issue. I would venture to say that most Americans are not aware that the airwaves even belong to the public or them. And I would like to ask the commission, if the public interests

standard is being served, then why is the public unaware that they have a right to look at their local station's license renewal applications? Their TV and radio stations.

I just want to just say very briefly that I happened to look at several stations' files recently. During the last -- the end of the last license renewal period. Before it was -- their license -- licenses were going to be renewed. And I was shocked at the way I was treated.

At one station, I was treated like an intruder. I was interrogated, I was asked who I was. Who did I represent? I couldn't just be an individual. I had to represent some organization. At another, they sent in the security guard when I started looking -- after I first ask the person who was in charge in the general manager's office could I look at the file. And he said I was not allowed to look at the file.

Now, this is in deep contrast to the way I was treated many years ago when there was a Fairness Doctrine. When we had more rights. And I just like to say that this is something that's really important. These -- these are public documents. The stations do not go out of their way to let people know that they have a right to do a license challenge. That they can challenge the license renewal of their local stations. They can talk about the discrimination. They can look at the files and see and -- and see where -- their irregularities.

But if the public doesn't even know they have a right to

do this, if they don't even announce it anymore on public service ads that say you have a right to come to your -- these -- our station and look at our license renewal file, I think this a very important right and I think it's being misused.

MS. KENNEDY: My name is Mimi Kennedy and I'm an actress. I was on a show called Dharma and Greg. And I really came here as a citizen, but I realized when I showed up, people might have thought I came to bite the hand the feeds me. I really am here not for any organization. KPFK, which is listener sponsored radio, the only radio that I listen to along with some of the NPR stations, alerted me to the fact that this was going and I didn't write down where. So then I had to do half an hour searching on the Internet to ask the right question to find out where this actually was. It wasn't on the USC website and it certainly wasn't on the FCC website.

So this brings to fore the -- whoever controls the facts controls the narrative. And the problem with consolidation is the facts are in fewer hands. We'd like to trust that, but we simply can't. The Founding Fathers didn't, and we need democracy, a multiplicity of voices, a multiplicity of people collecting and interpreting facts.

I remember -- I'm conditioned by the Cold War and how we used to laugh at the idea there were elections in the Soviet Union or that they had news and it was Pravda. And we were

very merry about the fact that you couldn't trust it for real news. I would hate to see America devolve into this, but I never watch television news because a certain part of me feels as if I'm watching some Pravda-like cheerleading and I won't necessarily be getting the facts that I do on listener sponsored radio, which I'm lucky enough to have in Los Angeles.

I really wanted to come here and have the FCC hear how upset I am as a citizen about hate radio. I've just listened to it to educate myself, and I am shocked that the devolution of the airwaves that most Americans listen to has sunk to this. And now I see why our democracy is becoming more difficult because people feel this discourse of ridicule and threat and demonization is proper patriotic discourse.

The FCC should certainly be ashamed of itself that it has let things get so far on AM radio. I don't think further consolidation will solve this problem. Therefore, I would like to support the people who said here, as Marty Kaplan with his Pew research study, we certainly need to not vote on anything June 2nd.

The public isn't here because the public didn't know.

This isn't a public town hall. God bless us, we're providers.

I realize I'm here as a professional actress. Unwittingly,

more appropriately here as that certainly than any member of

the public. There is only one other person that I met here who

came -- I'm sure there are more of you, but in my speaking --

as a member of the public. So, please, FCC -- who is ever watching this -- do not think this was a public town hall. The public doesn't know. The public is not here and that goes back to whoever controls the facts controls the narrative. The facts are not out there that this is happening. The public control of the airwaves is an illusion. I don't want our democracy to become an illusion.

So absolutely hold off this vote and look at what you do before you make our democracy an illusion by having fewer people control the facts. And they don't have a good record with this so far. Thank you.

MR. FRIED: Well, they say don't follow children and animals. Let's add actresses to that. I wish I had gone earlier. Thanks, first of all, for everybody who is still here. I was hoping to speak to a few more people, including an FCC commissioner. But I guess we have to settle for the tape.

My name is Alan Fried of Minneapolis and Santa Monica. I split my time. I worked in the radio industry between 1977 and 2000, both commercial and non-commercial radio. And I have worked in the Internet business related to Internet radio since 2000.

While I'm not involved with radio broadcasting currently,

I continue to believe in its fundamental value as a

communication service, for information and entertainment, and

its unique qualities of immediacy, portability, relatively low

consumer cost and ability to be used while engaging in other activities. Can't really do that with television.

My interest in the issue of media consolidation and control dates back to 1996 and the period immediately following the passage of the Telecom Act of that year. I speak today as a listener and as a -- I guess a former broadcaster.

Additionally, I'm pleased to mention that the late Minnesota senator, Paul Wellstone, was one of the handful of senators who did not vote for the Telecom Act. He was a good man.

In absentia, I would like to thank you, Commissioner

Copps, for your strong position on public hearings about this
important issue of media control. Contrary to suggestions by

Chairman Powell and Commissioner Abernathy that the public
record on this issue via paper and electronic filings is
sufficient, these faceless -- those faceless opinions and
contributions are not equal to face-to-face meetings and panels
at broadcasting conventions with any B executives.

Even hearings and forums like this one today aren't the same or really equal to one-on-one meetings like you have inside the beltway. But they are affording those outside the beltway the opportunity for some type of face-to-face contact with the FCC. And I think that's important, as others have said earlier.

I have read and heard comments of broadcasting industry figures, FCC Commissioners, and staff and pundits which have

referred to the broadcasting marketplace or the free market as it pertains to broadcasting. They argue that the demands of the marketplace should dictate the dynamics of control and of content of programming. That's an appropriate concept in a truly open marketplace, but broadcasting isn't an open marketplace by virtue of its finite playing field. A finite spectrum. Such a close, privileged marketplace of a public resource requires -- no, it really demands oversight and regulation in the public interest.

I'm not suggesting lots of regulations but enough to protect the public interest. That's the fundamental role of the FCC and a role that it has be charged with since radio regulation began in this country in 1920's. Protection of the public interest is underscored when we consider the current control structure and that new entrants are now rare — certainly in medium and major markets — and that the barrier to the entry that has always existed — that spectrum issue again — has tightened.

Making entry even more difficult, stations have for years routinely received license renewals virtually automatically. It's virtually unheard of for a station to lose its license for violations of rules or under license renewal challenge. If it's even challenged. When the commission does act on violations, overwhelmingly on technical or procedural issues, stations are slapped with fines that are so small and

inconsequential they're considered a cost of doing business and quickly forgotten.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In short, there is little accountability by radio and TV stations, who have been afforded the privileged of holding a broadcast license and different operators are virtually excluded from participating or entering.

Having said that, I'm pleased that the commission recently grew a backbone and levied fine that prompted the industry to take notice. That of a \$27,000 fine a couple weeks ago against WKRK in Detroit.

With that in mind, my point here is that there's a major difference, which I have yet heard discussed in this process, when invoking the concept of the expanding media marketplace. A concept which is a primary justification for relaxing There is a difference between broadcasting and control. publishing, for instance, and between broadcasting and the Internet. Anyone can start their own website and audio stream. Anyone can launch a publication. Newspapers on the Internet are not regulated like broadcasting and, more importantly, they are not a finite class, like broadcasting. They are free market enterprises. To mix them together with broadcasting when discussing the issue of regulation and consolidation is inappropriate unless the FCC somehow has plans to somehow opening -- to open the broadcasting playing field, but I don't think they are looking to do that.

Further, broadcasting is considered as and licensed as a public service. The public has historically expected and depended on news and information from radio and television.

And while sites on the Internet offer news and information, the Net does not enjoy the penetration, affordability and reach of broadcasting. And the public has yet to demand -- depend on the Net, as it does broadcasting. Although that's changing, I think the attitude of radio and TV as a reason for that, but I digress.

And I appreciate the public outreach that Commissioner

Copps has afforded us. I trust that he and the commission will

hear us and act accordingly in the public interest. And I can

only hope that we in the future can get more time because we

all know that people like the NAB get plenty of it inside the

beltway. Thank you.

MS. DILLARD: Yes, my name is Joyce Dillard. I'm a citizen who lives in the congressional district of Xavier Becerra, in a community that's majority Latino, low income, high in immigration.

And I'm here to address the lack of creativity in all forms of communication, both broadcast and print. The children are dying, literally. They are so depressed, it's hard to describe. Communication is supposed to bring hopes and dreams. It's supposed to trigger their ambitions, and we don't see that.

We see that they love their families. We're a working class community with small businesses, but the big conglomerate is drug trafficking. It produces gang crime, fast money and cheap thrills. We also know that the our children aren't looking for their future in order to be able to afford cable or the Internet or computers.

It was nice to see Congressman Becerra here, but very few know there's a congressional Hispanic Caucus. And even less, maybe I can count them on one hand, know that he's part of a telecommunications and technology taskforce. In fact, we have a political monopoly, but our monopoly is a one-party system. It happens to be the Democratic party in our area. They do not see a two-party system, free to compete and free to choose.

We ask that you look at this communications industry in all it's form as a conduit for the future of our children.

They are disengaged, and it's ultimately important that they cherish what our ancestors fought for and established, and that's our freedom in this world. Thank you.

MR. GROSH: I'm Eric Grosh. I'm a physician. I also have some training in engineering, and a concerned citizen. I have been very impressed with a lot of the eloquence from the other speakers, both on the panel and from the public. I've been in and out -- drifting in and out of tears at some the terrific words that have been spoken.

I just wanted to start off with a notification that I --

that I think I detected the fallacy of equivocation here.

There is a difference in the use of the term public interest, I thought, between the first panel and the second panel. The first panel, the measure of public interest is rating score, it seemed to me. And the second panel, I think, took the correct view that it's what the public good serves.

And I'd just also like to note a thing that came to recently, the advantages of books. If you go into a bookstore there is a distinct clarification of this side, these shelves are devoted to nonfiction -- these sides -- these shelves are devoted to fiction. And it's not all that clear on the -- on the electronic media. My scientific training instructs me that empirical evidence is defined as experimental evidence.

Now, the experiment can be carried on in a sort of formal control manner or it can be viewed in the broader context of the real world. And I'd just like to go over a few of the -- the pieces of empirical evidence that it would seem to be germane to this discussion that the court order mandated.

Sort of at the top of the list to my mind is the question that arouse after 9/11 -- why do they hate us? After 150 years of aggressive war by the United States in multiple, foreign military adventures, that this should be an unfathomable mystery is an unfathomable mystery to me. And then George Bush's -- here's the man holding the highest status office in the land, has so much confidence in the PR efficacy of the

media that he has the temerity to answer that question with, "They hate us", speaking of the -- of the 9/11 hijackers and their planners -- "They hate us for our freedom." That he could dare to insult our intelligence to that extent.

This is a piece of empirical evidence. It's like, what George Carlin would call the turd in the punchbowl. It is so awful that nobody wants to mention it. There are other multiple bits of evidence. Another one was the fabrications that proceeded the war in Iraq. That Saddam Hussein was the bad guy in everything and everything — anything and everything. That he was importing Uranium from Africa, which was a forgery, the documentation that supported that — that evidently persuaded Diane Feinstein and her colleagues in the Senate to support the war resolution when they had not done so before.

That he was a -- an ally of Al Qaeda in some respect.

That war that we -- received the signal that war is no more than a sterile, bloodless video game, which is the impression we get from the Pentagon war briefings.

And I just wanted to close by talking about -- as an engineer, I learned about feedback loops. That certain -- a certain action in one direction causes certain consequences in another part of the loop. If you have corporations that manufacture munitions also in charge of media conglomerates, then they will look out for their interest up and down the

entire vertical structure of their entire corporation.

Therefore, they -- because they sell munitions they favor war. If you have more war you have increased revenues.

Increased diversion of tax revenues from your pocket and mine into the corporate coffers. Increased campaign donations -- contributions to politicians, who then -- this is a formula for maintaining the status quo, in which we have a so-called two-party system -- Democrats and Republicans are the two branches of the fat-cat party.

The Vietnam radical -- the Vietnam War radicalized the population by two, basically two factors -- the deaths of Americans who were compelled to serve by a draft and the prolongation of the war for almost 30 years. So they -- they took the opposite tack -- let's have nothing but Blitzkrieg war, fast in, fast out and eliminate the draft, so that only people who nobody cares about -- the vast silent majority that nobody cares about -- the poor and the disenfranchised -- are subjected then to an economic draft.

So more war, more munitions, more corporate profit, more tax revenues diverted to corporate coffers and so forth. And so the cycle continues in the vast feedback loop that is secured by the media. Mollifying the population by prettifying war, making it a matter of taste, eliminating the blood and so forth. That's -- that's basically mine.

MR. KAY: My name is Scott Kay, and I'm here as a citizen.

I heard all the panelists this morning, and I did not hear one justification for the public benefit of further consolidation of the media companies. We heard a lot today about the five or six media owners and a little-told story is that those very same media owners have exported tens of thousands of American jobs from this country.

There was a recent Los Angeles Times poll about the war in Iraq and the approval of the President. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents gave their main source of news about the war as cable news channels. Fascism has been defined as the merger of corporate and government interests. Presently, we don't need a Ministry of Propaganda.

MR. WATTS: Hi, my name is Gary Watts. I'm member of Teamsters Local 399. I'm an active member. And I'm quite concerned what the media mergers mean to my labor organization as well as any other labor organization out there.

We need to have an outlet for our opinions, to get our issues across. We are having several problems here. What I'm seeing is that media mergers is not serving the public's interest. When the media mergers came about in the -- throughout the years, it was with the intent to better serve the members or better to serve the general public. And I yet - I have seen this yet to happen here.

The only thing I see it as a self-serving interest of the -- of the major media conglomerates here. What I'm

starting to see now is we're talking about 500 channels. I see 250 channels of reruns. That is not serving the general public here. What I've come to find out is we have to -- let me go over my notes here real quick. I'm blind here. Okay.

There's a lot of issues here. I'm kind of brain locked here. We have to look at some of these -- these mergers. When we go into these mergers we're starting to look at some -- all these different business models. We're seeing some bad business models starting to merge with another bad business module. So it just destined for failure on this aspect here. I do not see that -- any light at the end of tunnel as far as benefiting the public.

A couple of things I do have to question. If the FCC is so concerned that the public is served, they have yet to mandate any type of regulation in such a manner that there must be a public notification on the channels 60 or 30 days prior to any media merger taking place or any FCC review taking place.

I've yet to see that put in -- put out on the table here. I think the FCC has failed in this matter in a very large manner. That's it, sorry.

MR. WATALATO: Which camera is rolling? This one? Okay.

My name is Ralph Watalato. I'm a graduate student at the

Annenberg School of Journalism. I -- when I -- when I saw a

lot of the speakers and a -- and a lot of what was said here, I

think that there is a cultural divide between people who have a

socialist orientation and a free-market orientation.

And I would like the commissioners to know that the person speaking to you is a registered Republican that worked on Bush's campaign up 'til 15 minutes before the polls closed. I have a background as a free marketeer, and I'm very firmly supportive of a free market. But I think there is a difference between supporting free markets and following the dictates of the law.

The 1996 Telecommunications Act gives you two bases that you -- two -- two factors that you need to look at. One of them is an economic diversity factor. The other one is an ownership and viewpoint diversity factor. The first one is a statutory mandate. The second one is a constitutional mandate. I think, between the two, the constitutional mandate will trump the statutory mandate.

I agree with a lot of what Mr. Levin said -- Jay Levin -- on the panel -- about the non-privileged voices not being heard in the current media environment. I also agree with what Mr. Connolly from AFTRA said about Clear Channel having killed local radio and about voice tracking.

As a person looking for employment in the media industry,

I can say that there are very few opportunities today for

somebody to move into local radio, because everything is a

national broadcast. You have one person working in New York or

Los Angeles and the same thing -- pardon me -- the same thing

is broadcast -- simulcast nationwide.

I also agree with Mr. Kaplan, Marty Kaplan, that there is a crying need for more study. I did some research for the Center for Communication Law and Policy on the radio side of this issue. And I will say that I spent a lot time looking for studies on this issue and I couldn't find much. We really need more study before we change the rules, because I do agree that it is like a gamble.

He had a more colorful way of putting that -- the riverboat gamble, it is. It really is. I agree on a -- on a philosophical basis with Commissioner Abernathy, but I have to say also that the very people from whom you get your intellectual ammunition in the Libertarian intellectual movement, in the think tanks, in places like Reason Magazine, those people are heartily criticizing you because, as one of the last speakers said, this is not a free market in the broadcast media. It is privileged market. We don't have unlimited entry into this marketplace. There are some very great barriers to entry.

I've read FCC opinions where they have actually made the argument that higher prices for stations are good and they've confounded the concept of ratings with public interest.

I think that there are two different concepts. One of them is an economic concept; the other is a viewpoint diversity concept. And I think that you need -- if you're looking for

legal bases for your decision, you need to make a distinction between the two.

Just as credit cards and phone cards -- I'm going to give you an analogy. You go out and look for a credit card today. They are required, by regulation, to give everybody the same information about what their rates are. So you can have a properly functioning marketplace because you have regulation. You look at phone cards, well, you don't know if they are going to charge you \$5 for using the phone even though they say they're three cents a minute or they're going to deduct a dollar every month that you don't use it, or it's not going to work in three weeks.

You have no idea in the marketplace what compares with what and, therefore, you can't have a free market. Because you don't have proper information and regulation in the marketplace. There is a need for some regulation to have a functioning free market, and this is the FCC's job.

I would say in addition to greater research here in the United States, that the FCC could look to some other markets in other countries. I just did a thesis on Singapore. Singapore is a country of three to four million people. It's only 326 square miles. It has 18 radio stations and 7 TV stations. And yet, out of all that media, you would think there would be a great diversity of media with such a small population. Only three stations are not controlled by the government or by

government controlled corporations.

This is the problem that you are going to end up with in the United States if you do not abide by your constitutional duty to maintain viewpoint diversity. Thank you.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Hi, my name is Matt Goldsmith. I'm trained as an attorney and in the arts. I graduated from law school in 1980 and I've been alarmed at the changes in the country since that time, both in anti -- the lack of antitrust enforcement, the rise of mergers and acquisitions during that time, and the sense of the idea of the villainization of the public good. And of the idea of either the federal government or a -- the public.

And I think that the we need to return to the basic concepts that this country was founded under, which was a check and balances system. And that's the brilliance of our constitution and why it has been able to sustain itself all this time is that we have three branches government. It was based on the checks and balances systems, which incidentally we were benefited from the study of Benjamin Franklin and also the study of the Iroquois and -- tribes.

And we need to return, I agree with others, back to a scholarship about what are the fundamentals of this country in terms of democracy. Now that we're the most powerful country and an example for democracy around the world and we control the world, it is important that we truly understand what

democracy is.

And there needs to be an active debate in Congress, not along partisan lines, but along scholarship. And that's why I'm glad that the Annenberg School is participating in this. I would hope that they would also do more work in terms of understanding linguistics. Noam Chomsky is known -- has done such important work following Marshall McLuhan, because he is a linguist. And when you study the basics of language and how language affects human people and communications, that's where you begin to understand the most important aspects of what individual decision making is about in a democracy.

And I would also want to point out that we've learned some lessons recently. The President, the current president, George Bush ran against the idea of nation building. We are now nation building in Afghanistan and we're nation building in Iraq. And if we're going to that kind of nation building and set an example, I think its important that we set an example for an openness in the principles that Jefferson and Washington and Franklin and the founders of this country set in the types of debate and discussion and alternative points of view and access to those points of view that enabled us to come up with, as they said, not the most perfect form of government but the best one we have yet.

And the same thing has been said about capitalism. It isn't perfect, but it's the best thing yet. I do think that we

need to look at Adam Smith. Go back to the roots of capitalism. Adam Smith was a pre-capitalist and look at what does it mean to have competition versus some sense of control. And the same way that we had a balance between the states and the federal government, we need to have a balance between corporations, between individual small businesses, non-corporations and the public good.

I think people, in seeing how this country responded after 9/11 and supports the military, that is not a private thing.

That is -- although it's funded privately -- I mean it funds private businesses to create the weaponry that -- that give us the technology to be the strongest military -- the public good is owned by the people and that's where we should come back to in this very important debate.

And I hope that it -- June 2nd is not the final -- final vote on this. And I would further just point out that Mr. Powell was part of the antitrust -- chief of the antitrust branch of the Attorney General's Office before. And we need to review his points of view about antitrust as well. Because it's -- these issues are very much the same issues at the time that this decision is made. Thank you.

MS. SHEPARD: My name is Kay Shepard. I'm a teacher, a vocal instructor, and dream maker center for the inspiring performing artist. We have a cultural mission to bring the value of the arts into our culture. And we train artists of

every kind to attempt to make cultural change and bring cultural awareness to the value of the arts in our society.

And we increasingly find it more and more difficult to get works heard and have to really go to the level of an Oprah show to bring something to the public.

I really want to thank Commissioner Copps for being here, and I have a very simple request because he said he would listen to us. And it is that clear instructions be given to we, to us, the public for what we can do about this situation in the next month.

In our own organization we have many people that we could mobilize, but clear instructions are lacking. And Commissioner, what you told us to do -- to write to people, to contact people in public offices is the right instruction, I'm sure. But are there specific people, specific phone numbers, specific letters we could write that would do something to avert this catastrophe in June?

And if there are, is there a way, that now that you've been here that we could get these instructions fast enough to do something about it? Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ: For those of you who stayed, I thank you very much. I really appreciate the fact that you were patient with -- with the session going long. Thanks a lot John Connolly for staying too. Thank you very much.

(Conclusion of Recorded Material.)